

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 11-13, 15, 16 and 18-35 are now in the application. Claims 1-13, 15, 16 and 18-35 are subject to examination. Claims 11 and 30 have been amended. Claims 31-35 have been added. Claims 14 and 17 have been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 11, 13-17, and 30 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,483,652 B2 to Nakamura under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicants respectfully traverse with regard to claim 17.

The limitations of claim 17 have been added into claim 11. If the Examiner desires, additional support may be found by referring to the specification at page 6, line 11 through page 7, line 8, for example. Since the feature added into claim 11 was previously in claim 17, the amendment should not necessitate further search or consideration.

Claim 11 now specifies that the lens support is formed of a thermoplastic material and that the housing is formed of a thermosetting material.

In contrast to the feature of claim 11 copied above, page 6, lines 51-56 of Nakamura teach that the integral package and lens holder are both formed

from a thermosetting resin that is injected between the molds 11 and 12 (See Fig. 9). Therefore, Nakamura did not anticipate cancelled claim 17, and Nakamura does not anticipate amended claim 11.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 28 and 29 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,483,652 B2 to Nakamura in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,353,070 to Mitani et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,822,041 B2 to Schottland et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Even if it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Mitani et al. and Schottland et al. with that of Nakamura, the invention as defined by claims 28 and 29 would not have been obtained for the reasons given above with regard to the deficiencies in the teaching of Nakamura with respect to the invention as now defined by claim 11.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 12, 18, 19, and 25 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,483,652 B2 to Nakamura in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,819,508 B2 to Chiang under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Even if it would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Chiang with that of Nakamura, the invention as defined by claims 12, 18, 19, and 25 would not have been obtained for the reasons given above with regard to the deficiencies

in the teaching of Nakamura with respect to the invention as now defined by claim 11.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 11. Claim 11 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 11.

Finally, applicants appreciatively acknowledge the Examiner's statement that claims 20-24, 26, and 27 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

The limitations of claims 23 and 20 have been presented in new claims. Since the features in the added claims were already under consideration, the amendment should not necessitate further search or consideration.

New claim 31 includes all of the limitations of claims 23, 12, and 11. Support for new claims 32 and 33 can be found by referring to claim 24.

New claim 34 includes all of the limitations of claims 20, 12, and 11. Support for new claim 35 can be found by referring to claim 21.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-13, 15, 16 and 18-35 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

A fee in the amount of \$ 150.00 has been enclosed for presenting three claims in excess of 20 (note that five new claims have been presented and two claims have been cancelled).

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Werner H. Stermer/  
Werner H. Stermer  
(Reg. No. 34,956)

MPW:cgm

March 12, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP  
P.O. Box 2480  
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480  
Tel.: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101